

United States Patent and Trademark Office

cen

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2006

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/657,132	09/09/2003	Ching-Hsu Yang	YANG3150/EM	1902	
23364	7590 11/20/2006		EXAMINER		
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC			MITCHELL, JAMES M		
	625 SLATERS LANE FOURTH FLOOR			PAPER NUMBER	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			2813		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/657,132	YANG, CHING-HSU		
Examiner	Art Unit		
James M. Mitchell	2813		

	James M. Mitchell	2813	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 23 October 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aft tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I (a) They raise new issues that would require further coincide (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belowed) 	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.125. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		empliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ils to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. 	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). ((PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		•
13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	CARL WHITEHEAD, JP.	Ex.Mitchell J.D.	1/1
	SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER	// // //	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20061110A

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

irrespective if applicant appreciated that his cap dissipated heat and therefore was a sink or spreader, because applicant's cap was of the same high heat conductive material as applicant's recognized heat sink (e.g. AIN or CuW; Col 5, Lines 37-42), it also dissipated heat since it was connected to the sink by heat conductive material ("m" and "s"; Col. 6, Lines 24-30); a packaging cap and heat sink are not mutually exclusive. See M.P.E.P 2112[R-3]("[T]he discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer." Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc., 190 F.3d 1342, 1347, 51 USPQ2d 1943, 1947 (Fed. Cir. 1999)).

Likewise, the modification of creating holes in the cap of Nishiguchi would not destroy its hermetic seal, because the holes of Williams were disclosed as being formed through the middle of a sink along an "X" plane. Such an incorporation of holes in the middle of the cap along an "X" plane of Nishiguchi's cap would not destroy its seal, since it would not penetrate into its cavity that is along its "Y" plane.

Lastly, contrary to applicant's assertion the combination of Tao and Nishiguchi would destroy the invention of Tao, because pins that increase heat dissipation as indicated in the office action could be incorporated into the top middle portion of Tao's package shown for example in Fig. 1 or 7, without obstructing the plurality of through holes (10 or12) permitting moisture release. Furthermore, although Nishiguchi does not show any open holes besides those filled with pins, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In this instance, Nishiguich would have suggested a means to increase heat dissipation.

Continuation of 13. Other: note attached 892, showing in Harigaya a heat dissipating AgPd and in Distefano showing a cap that is also a heat sink.